

ability and induce in Western Europe "realistic" trends toward disengagement and neutrality.

It is within the power of the West to compel the Soviet rulers to reckon with an important risk factor in Eastern Europe. The risk factor is indeed in direct ratio with the intensity of the spirit of resistance of the people of East-Central Europe. And the later hinges on the prevailing impression with regard to the will to win of the West and with regard to the Western commitment to the cause of their freedom and independence. These are the sources of hope on which the spirit of resistance feeds.

Until the Cuban events, the prevailing impression on both counts was negative. Hope in a better future and faith in the West, and with them the spirit of resistance, were at their lowest ebb. The Cuban confrontation has somewhat improved the assessment of Western will and power. Should the West, as it is hoped, appear henceforth consistently in the posture of the firm and winning side, the problem of keeping hope alive and thereby strengthening the East-Central European deterrent will have been largely solved. It remains however for the West to prove its concern for the people of East-Central Europe. This can only be accomplished by an early and clear identification of the West with the peoples of the captive countries and their goal to recover free choice in regard to their internal and international affairs.

Such a long-range objective is not unrealistic. Liberation without war, though not without protracted political struggle, is possible. The Soviet empire is obviously rent by serious internal contradictions. The difficulty of maintaining ideological unity and central direction, as illustrated by the Sino-Soviet discord; the inability of the Soviet Union to keep up the armament race without withdrawing some of the material improvements its people have gained in the last few years, and/or without diminishing their abnormally high investments in the heavy industry; the imbalanced nature of the Communist economy and the utter failure of collectivized agriculture; the increasing nonconformity of youth and the ferment among intellectuals; the unbridgeable gulf between the requirements of subordination and exploitation in the Soviet empire, and the national pride of the historic nations of East-Central Europe—these are but a few of the contradictions. If they have, as yet, not generated dramatic consequences, this is largely due to the demoralizing effect of the easy and unnecessary successes Western misjudgment, irresolution and weakness have afforded to the U.S.S.R. Ever since the end of the Second World War, the Soviets have been permitted to show, by their actions, that history was on their side; that changes invariably occur in their favor and that, accordingly, the victory of communism on a worldwide scale is only a matter of time. If the West were to act on the perfectly justified assumption that the Soviet empire has more reasons to fear any major war than the West, it could at least deny its adversary any further successes. The effect would be most far reaching. The latent forces of disruption and opposition, no longer inhibited by a sentiment of futility, would be unleashed in Eastern Europe. In favorable circumstances, which can be fostered by a purposeful Western policy, such as a struggle for supreme power or internal disturbances in the Soviet Union that would tie down the Soviet armed forces, the captive nations could begin making good their escape.

III

In the view of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, the morale of the captive European peoples and their faith in the West would be bolstered, and the interest—

short and long term—of both free and captive nations would be advanced should the United States and her principal allies adopt the specific measures listed under "What to do," while refraining from the action listed under "What not to do."

What to do

(1) To raise in all high-level conferences with the rulers of the Soviet Union the issue of the restoration of the right of self-determination to the peoples of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

(2) To counter Soviet demands on Berlin with the plan for an overall peace settlement based on the right of self-determination and designed to solve all the unresolved consequences of the Second War in Europe.

(3) To inscribe the question of the denial of self-determination to the nations of East-Central Europe on the agenda of the United Nations regardless of the prospect to secure the required majorities. To raise, in other words, the issue in the U.N. on its merits and not as a mere point of rebuttal.

The initial purpose of such action would be to assure the peoples concerned that their issue is an objective of Western policy, an open and not a closed issue as claim the Soviet rulers. This would be accomplished if a group of Western Powers, backed by the United States, would take the initiative. For durable impact, such action would have to be renewed at every session on the pattern of the wearing-down tactics followed by the Soviet Union on the question of the Chinese representations in the United Nations. The Western Powers could easily pattern their draft resolution on one of the proposals introduced in the United Nations by the Soviet Union. The draft resolution introduced by the Soviet delegation on April 24, 1962, in the Special Committee on Decolonization, is almost ideally suited for this purpose.

(4) To keep the question of Hungary on the agenda of each United Nations General Assembly session and renew steadfastly the demand for compliance with past resolutions.

(5) To give assurance to the people of Albania that the territorial integrity of their country and their right of self-determination will be safeguarded against any intervention on the part of their neighbors.

(6) To maintain carefully the policy of nonrecognition of the forcible incorporation of the Baltic States in the Soviet Union.

(7) To insist that the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is of universal scope and validity and, accordingly, oppose the double-standard gaining ground in the U.N. on self-determination, and to urge the Special Committee of 24 Nations, charged with the implementation of the above declaration, to extend its concern and investigation to the peoples and countries subjected to Soviet colonial rule.

(8) To carry out in the United Nations and at all appropriate international gatherings a campaign of truth with respect to the denial of human rights and freedom in the captive countries.

(9) To give support in the United Nations to the proposal of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions for an investigation of the condition and status of political prisoners and for the elaboration and enactment of an international convention on the regime of the political prisoners.

(10) To be always mindful, in their trading policies, of the fact that the interests of the welfare of the captive peoples and of the security of the West are both adversely affected by the preferential treatment given by the Communist regimes in East-Central Europe to the development of heavy and armament industries, at the expense of the needs of the people concerned. Similarly, to take advantage of trade negotiations in order to press for the suppression of existing

prohibitive duties on individual food, clothing, and medicine gift packages from the free world to individuals in the captive countries.

(11) To develop, extend and invigorate broadcasts to the captive countries, and to consider the establishment, in the framework of NATO, of a general staff for political warfare.

(12) To warn all Western visitors to the captive countries against permitting their hosts to use them as tools of their political propaganda, as well as against fraternization with local Communist leaders.

What not to do

(1) Not to engage in actions or enter into agreements implying or suggesting that the Western Powers have reconciled themselves to the status quo and regard it as final. The oft-mentioned idea of a nonaggression pledge or pact between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries would certainly be construed by the people of East-Central Europe as a Western sellout. Such pledges would give the Soviet Union or their puppets no guarantees of security that are not already embodied in the United Nations Charter. The only reason the Soviet rulers have consistently sought them was their awareness that they would create legal obstacles to any further Western concern with the fate of the captive peoples, and that, by generating discouragement and resignation, they will have consequences highly detrimental to Western security. Past commitments, declared principles and self-interest, therefore equally command to the Western Powers to stand firmly on the position that any and all security arrangements should follow, and not precede, an overall European settlement based on the right of self-determination.

(2) Not to undertake actions and moves which give respectability to the satellite regimes and compound the damaging effects of past acts of recognition.

(3) Not to grant aid, long or short term credits to the satellite regimes. Assistance in the special case of Poland can only be justified to the extent it helps preserve the gains the Polish people wrested in 1956. The helping countries should, therefore, make it clear that any aid would terminate if there is a return to forced collectivization, and/or if the rights of the church, the freedom of worship or any other rights or freedoms were further curtailed.

(4) Not to place undue reliance on the political benefits to be drawn from exchange programs, and to insist on full reciprocity in such exchanges.

New York, March 1963.

FORMATION OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to a most encouraging development relating to the question of Cuba.

I think we are all agreed that something must be done about Cuba, that the continued existence of a Communist dictatorship 90 miles from our shore is intolerable. We are all agreed that the means must be found, short of war, to liberate the Cuban people from Castroism and to put an end to the threat of Communist subversion and infiltration of the American States by the Kremlin's beachhead forces in Cuba.

It is understandable and proper that there should be differences of opinion on the means to be employed and on the timetable which must govern the application of these means.

It is unfortunate, however, that there should be a polarization of opinion on the question of Cuba, because the solu-

tion of this question imperatively demands the greatest possible degree of national unity.

It is also unfortunate that some of the criticism of our present Cuban policy has been characterized by partisan overtones. It is unfair, as well as unfortunate, because some of these partisan critics conveniently forget that Castro came to power under a Republican administration, which for some strange reason ignored warnings from many sources that Castro was a Communist and his movement was Communist dominated.

Last week the press announced the establishment of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, as a broad nonpartisan organization dedicated to the goal of Cuban liberation. I consider this a most welcome development.

In its declaration of purpose, the committee particularly emphasizes its nonpartisan nature. It says that it believes that Cuba is an issue that transcends party differences, and that its solution demands the kind of national unity the American people have manifested at moments of crisis.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba plans to initiate a nationwide discussion on the problem of Cuba, and to establish an information service on Cuba and the Castro-Communist subversion of Latin America. In collaboration with Freedom House of New York, it convened a Free Cuba Assembly, at Ardsleigh, N.Y., last week, at which top authorities on Latin America examined the problem of Cuba in all its aspects. The findings of this assembly will soon be published.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the statement of purpose of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba, as well as a list of the distinguished citizens who have thus far joined the committee. I also ask consent to insert in the Record an editorial on Cuba which appeared in last Tuesday's Washington Post, and which, I believe, spoke for the American people when it declared that something must be done about communism in Cuba.

There being no objection, the statement of purpose, list of citizens, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba is being formed in response to a statement issued by Freedom House, on March 25, 1963, calling upon Americans to unite in a movement for a free Cuba.

The committee is nonpartisan. It believes that Cuba is an issue that transcends party differences, and that its solution requires the kind of national unity we have always manifested at moments of great crisis. This belief is reflected in the broad and representative membership of the committee.

The committee holds, with Freedom House, that a Communist Cuba is intolerable, not only for reasons which bear upon our security but also because it has betrayed 6 million people who won their freedom from the Batista dictatorship.

But the enslavement of those 6 million may now lead to the enslavement of the more than 200 million people in the 19 remaining Latin American Republics, for the Communists, from their base in Cuba, have launched a grand offensive aimed at conquering, initially, the entire continent south

of the Rio Grande. Ultimately, that offensive is directed at the chief bastion of world democracy, the United States.

The situation of Latin America, thanks primarily to the continued existence of a Soviet base in Cuba, is far worse than the American people realize. The Communist drive there is already on the way toward producing these serious consequences:

1. The demoralization of Latin America's democratic forces, who are beginning to feel overwhelmed before the combined power of the Cuban military-police state, the Soviet Union, and Red China.

2. The resurgence of dictatorial military elements intent on taking power in reaction to the Communist threat.

3. The infiltration and subversion of other Latin American governments at a tempo which may produce additional Cubas before long.

4. The frustration of inter-American efforts to achieve social and economic progress.

If not halted before much more time has passed, the Communist drive south of the Rio Grande could result in the gradual isolation of the United States from its friends and allies in Latin America—the reverse of the effort to isolate Communist Cuba.

The American people are united on the objective of a liberated Cuba. The President and the leaders of both major political parties have publicly committed themselves to that objective. Differences exist, however, on how and when to attain a free Cuba, and the problem is to devise a means of liberating Cuba from communism before communism succeeds in creating other Cubas, yet at the same time preserving the peace of the Americas.

The Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba believes that solutions to the problem can be found, and that, properly presented to the American people, they will command overwhelming support. To that end, the committee proposes:

1. To initiate, free of partisan bias, a nationwide discussion on the problem of Cuba, the threat its Communist regime poses to the Americas, and the measures that must be taken to put an end to it.

2. To establish, as an aid to intelligent and informed discussion, a national information service to disseminate regularly facts on Cuba and the Castro-Communist subversion of Latin America that are generally not circulated.

3. To join in the convening of a Free Cuba Assembly, at which all aspects of the problem will be submitted for the consideration of top authorities in Latin American and global affairs.

It is the hope of the Free Cuba Committee that such a program will help point the way to an effective Cuban policy, and that it will help create a climate of public opinion that will facilitate positive action.

An Alliance for Freedom must now be forged in the Americas if the Alliance for Progress is to succeed, and if the peoples of the Western Hemisphere are to live and work as free human beings for the society of peace and plenty they all seek. It is also an urgent requirement of American national interests. The indispensable first step toward the forging of such an Alliance is the liberation of the Cuban people from Communist tyranny.

The cause of a free Cuba is the cause of the free Americas.

MEMBERSHIP LIST OF CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR A FREE CUBA

Daniel James, executive secretary, author ("Cuba: The First Soviet Satellite in the Americas"), and foreign correspondent.

MEMBERS

Mariada Arensberg, executive secretary, Cuban Freedom Committee.

Murray Baron, labor-management consultant.

Joseph Belrne, president, Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO.

Nicholas Duke Biddle, chairman, Caribbean committee, International Rescue Service.

Irving Brown, U.N. Representative, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke (ret.), former Chief, U.S. Naval Operations.

Dickey Chapelle, author and foreign correspondent.

Leo Cherne, president, Research Institute of America.

Ernest Cuneo, chairman of the board, North American Newspaper Alliance; attorney.

Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations.

John Fisher, president, American Security Council, Chicago.

Dr. Russell H. Fitzgibbon, professor of Latin American history, University of California, Los Angeles.

Dr. Buell Gallagher, president, City College of New York.

Dr. Harry Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College.

Frances R. Grant, executive secretary, Inter-American Committee for Democracy and Freedom.

Paul Hall, president, Seafarers International Union.

Hal Hendrix, Latin American editor, Miami News.

Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley (retired), New York University.

Dr. Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy, New York University.

Dr. Harry Kantor, professor of Latin American history, University of Florida.

Rev. John Lafarge, S.J., associate editor, America.

Jay Lovestone, director of international publications, AFL-CIO.

Clare Boothe Luce, former U.S. Ambassador to Italy.

Eugene Lyons, senior editor, Readers' Digest.

Brig. Gen. S. L. A. Marshal, military commentator.

Henry Mayers, president, Cold War Council, Los Angeles.

Benjamin McLaurin, vice president, International Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, director, Center for Study of American Foreign Policy, Chicago.

Edgar Ansel Mower, author and foreign correspondent.

John O'Rourke, editor, Washington News.

Bonaro Overstreet, author, psychologist.

Bishop James A. Pike, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of California.

Virginia Prewett, Latin American columnist, North American Newspaper Alliance.

Victor Riesel, Labor columnist, Hall Syndicate.

Dr. John P. Roche, professor of labor and social thought, Brandeis University.

Serafino Romualdi, American Institute for Free Labor Development.

Sal B. Hoffmann, president, Upholsterers' International Union, AFL-CIO.

Dr. Robert Strausz-Hupe, director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Arthur G. McDowell, secretary, Council Against Communist Aggression.

Dr. Frank Tannenbaum, professor of Latin American history, Columbia University.

William vanden Heuvel, president, International Rescue Committee.

Dr. Arthur P. Whitaker, professor of Latin American history, University of Pennsylvania.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 1963]

REMEMBER THE MAINE

Something like a consensus on Cuban policy is beginning to emerge in this country.

The debate over when and how that policy

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

7131

is to be executed should not conceal the growing accord on the policy itself. Last week, the President, the former Vice President, the State Department, and Republican critics of the State Department had different things to say about Cuba, but on two points there was general agreement. And on these two points there is a gathering agreement in this country.

The broad proposition on which there is accumulating accord is simply this: that the existence of a Communist regime, linked to the Soviet Union, in this hemisphere, is a threat to the safety and survival of the United States and of all other free countries in this part of the globe. No administration that openly opposes this belief can long survive. Sooner or later an administration that denounced this maturing conviction would be followed by an alternative government committed to it. In a negative way, there is almost the same accord on how this policy should not be pursued. There is almost universal agreement that invasion, openly and directly, immediately or in the near future, is not the way to pursue our policy.

This aversion to foreign control of Cuba by a hostile power is the constant American attitudes toward our island neighbor. The Monroe Doctrine was an expression of a view already long held in this country. It was given even fuller expression in the administration of John Quincy Adams when this country made known its opposition to the transfer of Cuba from Spain to France, England, or any other power. The practical basis of this policy was clearly stated in Daniel Webster's support of President Adams' decision to send delegates to a conference with South American countries, in which the great orator said:

"A member has said that if Spain chose to transfer the island to any other power she has a right to do so, and we here cannot interfere to prevent her. I must dissent from this opinion. The rights of nations in matters of this kind are much modified by circumstances. Because France or Great Britain could not rightfully complain of the transfer of Florida to us, it does not follow that we could not complain of the cession of Cuba to one of them. The transfer of Florida to us was not dangerous to the safety of either of these nations, nor fatal to any of their great and essential interests. Proximity of position, neighborhood, whatever augments the power of injuring or annoying, very properly belong to the consideration of all cases of this kind. What might otherwise never be thought of is justified for these reasons and on these grounds."

If the American people are aware of such dangers now, they are aware of other dangers that unhappily and unfortunately also exist and that must be weighed with equal care and caution. Impetuous and impulsive and ill-considered acts by this country might bring on the dangers of thermonuclear war without diminishing the dangers of Soviet occupation of Cuba.

Therefore, it must be the object of the Government of the United States to develop some alternative to direct action that will further the policy of this country without incurring the hazard of invasion or like military intervention. It is very urgent that the Government develop such a policy and that it disclose it. It is very plain that, throughout this country, the conviction that the Nation is in peril is hardening to a point where no threats and no fears may be sufficient to inhibit the demand for action against the forces that occupy Cuba. Democratic governments are not wholly free agents. A government that does not develop a program of minimum risk runs the danger of being coerced into a program of maximum risks, almost against its will. The absence

of an affirmative design, in such a situation, is dangerous—dangerous to this country, to its neighbors and to the peace of the hemisphere and of the whole world.

The Government of this country, the governments of friendly countries and the Government of the Soviet Union as well had better take note of the increasing sense of Americans that the United States is endangered by the Soviet occupation of Cuba. This sense of jeopardy is beginning to pervade the whole body politic. The Soviet Government, whatever its fears and doubts, felt compelled, by such an impulse, to send its forces into Hungary. It ought to understand the much greater force that such sentiments exert upon democratic governments. Every day that passes without the termination of the Soviet occupation of Cuba increases the certainty and multiplies the likelihood that another *Matine* disaster will put the spark to the combustible materials in the Caribbean.

RETIREMENT OF THE VERY REVEREND LAURENCE J. MCGINLEY, S.J., AS PRESIDENT OF FORDHAM UNIVERSITY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 25, Fordham University announced the retirement of the Very Reverend Laurence J. McGinley, S.J., from the posts of president and rector of Fordham University. Father McGinley will be succeeded in these posts by the Reverend Vincent T. O'Keefe, S.J., at the end of the current academic year. Father O'Keefe is now executive vice president of the university, a position he has held since June 1962.

On relinquishing his present positions at Fordham, Father McGinley will serve as a consultant in higher education for the Jesuit Order.

Father O'Keefe takes over the duties of president and rector as the university enters on the second phase of its contemporary physical and academic growth at the Lincoln Square and Rose Hill campuses. He recently completed guidance of a 3-year self-study and evaluation of the university as a basis for the overall planning of Fordham's next decade of scholastic development.

Father McGinley has been president and rector of Fordham longer than any other man in its 122-year history. He was appointed February 2, 1949, and this year will participate in his 15th annual commencement exercises as president. During his tenure, the university will have conferred approximately 24,000 graduate and undergraduate degrees from its 9 colleges and schools.

As president, Father McGinley initiated a new university campus in mid-Manhattan-Fordham at Lincoln Square, a \$25,500,000 educational center that already houses the school of law and law library. Scheduled for construction in the immediate future are buildings to house the university's schools of education, business, social service, and general studies. As a campus, it will accommodate some 8,000 students and serve as companion to traditional Fordham at Rose Hill. The new buildings are to be ready for occupancy in September 1965.

Other highlights of his tenure as president include the completion of the uni-

versity's campus center building on the Rose Hill campus, a three-story structure with a wide variety of accommodations for cultural, social, and academic activities; the new Jesuit residence, Faber Hall, with housing facilities for 100 faculty members; the addition to Dealy Hall, the home of the Rose Hill campus division of the school of business; and Martyrs' Court, containing seven residence halls for upperclassmen.

During his presidency, also, charters have been granted to Fordham by these national scholastic honor societies: Phi Beta Kappa; Sigma Xi, a society to encourage original investigation in pure and applied science; and Pi Sigma Alpha, the political science fraternity.

The honors program of Fordham College, initiated to encourage independent scholarship among undergraduates, the junior year abroad, in Europe and in South America, and the Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies, the purpose of which is to foster the understanding of Russian culture and language, were initiated during his term of office. The first Rhodes and Marshall scholarships were won in this same period.

In June of 1961, the university, through Father McGinley, announced the opening of the Center of Intercultural Formation, in Mexico and Brazil, established to prepare both lay and religious personnel for service in Central and South America. The center, which he serves as president of the board of directors, gives intensive 4-month programs in the languages, history and social, economic and cultural conditions of Latin American countries.

A native New Yorker, Father McGinley was born on West 105th Street, September 6, 1905, the son of James and Alice (McCabe) McGinley. For many years his father was chief of staff to the commissioner of accounts of the city of New York. Father McGinley's younger brother, Rev. James J. McGinley, also a member of the Society of Jesus, is president and rector of Canisius College, Buffalo.

Father McGinley attended Public School 128 in Brooklyn and Xavier High School, Manhattan, and for a short period was employed in the First National Bank of New York. Xavier High School recently awarded him its Insignis Medal, given "to honor alumni who by their service to God and the civic community distinguished themselves as eminently representative of their alma mater and worthy of her special recognition."

He has been a member of the Society of Jesus since 1922, receiving his bachelor's and master's degrees from the society's college in Woodstock, Md. From 1929 to 1932 he taught at St. Joseph's Preparatory School, Philadelphia, returning to Woodstock in 1932 for theological studies.

Ordained to the priesthood in 1935, he received his licentiate in sacred theology the following year, and served for a time as chaplain at City Home Hospital on Welfare Island, N.Y. After further studies, he went to Rome in 1937 for graduate courses in theology at the Gregorian University and the Biblical

May 1

Institute, receiving his doctorate in sacred theology 2 years later.

In 1939 he served as director of the Vatican radio broadcasts, returning to the United States in the same year to become professor of theology at Woodstock College. After 1942, Father McGinley was prefect of studies, regent of the seminary and director of graduate studies at Woodstock, as well as associate editor of Theological Studies. He was a consultant of the Provincial of the New York Province of the Society of Jesus from 1943 to 1952.

Father McGinley is author of various articles in Theological Studies, Thought, Verbum Domini—Rome—and of the book, "Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives," published in 1944.

Active in educational circles, he is past president and vice president of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; former vice chairman of that association's commission on institutes of higher education; past president of the Association of Urban Universities, and presently a director of the New York Higher Education Assistance Corp. Other educational organizations of which he is a member are the New York State Advisory Council on Higher Education, and the council on higher educational institutions in New York City.

In 1960, Father McGinley was appointed to membership on the Commission on Federal Relations of the American Council on Education and was elected a director of the parent organization the following year to complete a term which expired in December 1962.

Father McGinley has been active also in the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, and its commission on independent colleges and universities. He served the association as president from 1957 to 1958, prior to which time he was secretary-treasurer. Since 1959 he has been a director of the New York World's Fair 1964-65 Corp., and director of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts since 1956.

Father McGinley was national awards chairman of the Freedom Foundation at Valley Forge in 1959, and has served on the Army Advisory Panel for ROTC affairs since 1958.

Among the honors accorded him are the following:

The American Irish Historical Society Gold Medal, 1960; the University Brotherhood Award of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1960; U.S. Army Outstanding Civilian Service Medal, 1962; Civic Award in Education, the Bronx Board of Trade, 1961; decorations from the Governments of Peru, Brazil, Chile, Italy, and most recently, the Grand Gold Badge of Honor for Merits to the Republic of Austria at the Austrian Embassy, Washington, 1963.

All who know Father McGinley, and all who know of the tremendous contributions he has made to Fordham University and to the whole educational world, will join me in paying tribute to this great scholar and educator as he lays down the enormous burden which he has carried so well for many years.

WHEAT REFERENDUM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Oregon has over 16,000 farmers who grow wheat and feed grains. Annually they produce and sell for cash about \$45 million worth of wheat and around \$30 million in feed grains.

This is modest production and income compared with the large wheat States—yet for these 16,000 farmers, wheat and feed grains are important and major cash crops—and they represent an important segment of our agricultural economy in Oregon.

Oregon grain farmers take a pragmatic approach to legislation affecting wheat and feed grains for this very reason. For 10 consecutive years, Oregon wheat farmers voted overwhelmingly in favor of marketing quotas in the national wheat referendums.

I am confident wheat farmers of Oregon will make their decision in the May 21 wheat referendum on the same practical dollars-and-cents basis. The difference between a "yes" and "no" vote in the referendum can mean over \$15 million in what income in Oregon. If I know Oregon farmers, they're going to vote their pocketbooks again in this referendum.

The 1964 wheat program is a good program. It assures a high level of wheat income and it stabilizes wheat production in line with demand, permits orderly disposal of our large surplus stocks.

Wheat farmers understand this. They understand that we cannot go on producing wheat on a continuing surplus basis and maintain price. They understand that they can't receive assured income without stabilizing production at usable levels.

That is why this bill had—and still has—the support of all the farm organizations except one and the support of most all of the cooperative and commodity groups interested in wheat.

Oregon has over 5,500 small allotment wheat farmers. For the first time in the history of wheat programs these farmers will be able to vote in a referendum and participate in the benefits of the wheat program. They will be treated exactly the same as major wheatgrowers. They will receive \$2 for their wheat on 80 percent of their quota and the basic support of \$1.30 for all the rest they can harvest on their allotment. Additionally, if they so desire, they can divert all their acres and receive diversion payments equal to 50 percent of parity times the average yield times the number of acres.

The certificates—having a value of 70 cents per bushel—represent a built-in insurance feature for all wheat farmers in case of crop failure.

I have no hesitation about urging all the wheat farmers in Oregon to vote "yes" in the May 21 referendum. Since a two-thirds approval is necessary to put the 1964 wheat program into operation this means that attitude alone is not enough. It means that every wheat farmer who cares about his wheat income has to take the trouble to vote on that day.

Any farmer who believes that new and better wheat legislation will be passed by

this session of the Congress in the event a "no" vote prevails, is taking the riskiest kind of gamble. My distinguished colleague who heads the Senate Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], is reported by the press the other day to have said: "You can put this in bold type: there won't be any more wheat laws passed this year if the referendum fails. I'll do everything on earth to stop it."

My recommendation is for wheat farmers to vote on the economic merits of the 1964 wheat program on May 21 and not on any pig in the poke.

In addition to approval of the wheat program, farmers need a feed grain program as well. Two weeks ago the House passed a good voluntary feed grain program—and it is my hope that the Senate will have before it in a few days the same program for consideration. I will support it.

As I read the program passed by the House, it will accomplish four necessary objectives:

First. It will raise farm income, by assuring fairer prices for feed grain producers and by providing a basis of stability for livestock prices.

Second. It will bring down further the surplus stocks of feed grains.

Third. It will save millions of dollars in costs to taxpayers, in contrast to the Government storage program which would be in effect without this legislation.

Fourth. It will give the wheat and feed grains producer new freedom and flexibility in the management and operation of his own farm. It will enable him to substitute acre for acre between feed grains and wheat whenever he finds that by doing so he will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of his own personal farming operation. Since this feed grains program is complementary to and interrelated to the wheat program enacted by Congress last year, prompt action on this feed grains measure is urgently needed so that wheat producers will have all of the available information in making their decision in the referendum on the 1964 wheat program on May 21, 1963.

By providing a permanent wheat program and a feed grain program, Congress will have made one of the most constructive steps in many years toward solving a major and plaguing problem in agriculture—that of income and surpluses, and at much less cost to the taxpayer. Congress and this administration can be proud of this accomplishment after 8 long years of declining farm income and mounting surpluses.

If Congress can move forward in the same constructive way in the other problem areas of agriculture, it will have accomplished a near miracle. I see no reason why we cannot—and I can think of every reason why we should.

I know that efforts are being made to turn this into a vote for or against "Government intervention" in wheat. That is pretty much of a phony issue. Government intervention in wheat production and marketing began in the 1930's, when the depression and its terrible impact upon farming brought about the

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the majority leader if he can give us some information as to the program for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this completes the legislative schedule for the week, and I know of no other business that will be before the House under our general reservation of programing additional business or conference reports for the balance of the week. We would like to have leave to wait until tomorrow, however, to finish the program for next week.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I will make the request for further information on tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

EXTENDING TIME WITHIN WHICH CERTAIN FEDERAL-STATE AGREEMENTS ON SOCIAL SECURITY MAY BE MODIFIED

(Mr. ST GERMAIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is similar to one I introduced last year on the same subject. This measure would extend from 1963 to 1966 the time within which certain Federal-State agreements may be modified to give noncovered State and local employees under the divided retirement system procedure an opportunity to elect coverage without undue financial hardship.

As I pointed out at the time I introduced this legislation last year, my State of Rhode Island now has what is known as a "divided retirement system." This means that the State of Rhode Island employees who belong to the State retirement system were enabled for social security purposes to divide, by referendum, the retirement system into two parts: Part a, those desiring coverage; part b, those who indicated by a "no"

vote in 1958 their desire not to be covered by social security.

The main obstacle to most State employees in joining the social security system is the prohibitive cost of making payments retroactive to 1956. To correct this problem, it is necessary for the States to have a further period of time in which to negotiate new Federal-State agreements and that the States be given the authority to determine the amounts their employees would pay in order to receive retroactive coverage under the social security system.

This bill is introduced after extensive consultation with the Honorable Raymond H. Hawksley, General Treasurer of Rhode Island, whose help and guidance have been invaluable. Since this measure meets a very real need, it is my hope that it will be favorably considered by the Congress.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

(Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, the President requested that the critics of our Cuban policy recommend constructive proposals rather than criticism of the present situation. I wish to present the following proposals in reply to that request.

Unless a more definite policy is established toward Cuba, we will be confronted with similar situations in other Latin American countries. Cuba has become a center of Communist subversion. Now that the Communists have established a beachhead in the Western Hemisphere, they will use this small island to prepare and train personnel to spread their insidious doctrine throughout Latin America.

For that reason, I believe that the following proposals certainly deserve close consideration if we are ever to arrive at the point of regaining the initiative which slowly slipped away from us after our short-lived blockade:

First. Prohibit all ships that carry cargo to Cuban ports from entering American ports. Also prohibit the owners and countries of such ships from trading with the United States. If they want to trade with Cuba, let them; but, let them know that they will not be able to trade with us.

Second. Establish a Cuban government in exile. This could be done through a special election. This is the democratic process. This would be the most practical solution, rather than to support a half dozen or so splinter groups. We should deal with one recognized government.

Third. Encourage hemisphere governments to prohibit travel to Cuba by Latin Americans for indoctrination and training in subversion and guerrilla warfare.

Fourth. Maximize the Soviet cost of supporting the Cuban regime by a selective boycott of those trading with Cuba.

Fifth. Maintain constant air and on-the-ground surveillance of Cuba.

Sixth. Prevent export or use of arms now in Cuba outside of Cuba.

Seventh. Continue to work toward complete political and economic isolation of Cuba by countries of the Western Hemisphere as well as the rest of the free world.

The free world trade with Cuba has declined from \$1.3 billion in 1959 to an estimated \$225 million in 1962. This amounts to an 83-percent decline. We should expand this battle through radio, press, books, television, and films, as well as through greatly expanded efforts to make contact with special groups, such as labor, student bodies, and the intellectual and cultural elite.

Eighth. Insist upon removal of all Russian military personnel from Cuba. Certainly 10,000 to 12,000 troops would hardly make a difference to Castro's military force which is now second only to the United States in the Western Hemisphere, unless these Russian troops were to be used to put down an internal uprising or to man missiles which we are told are no longer in Cuba.

To accomplish this end, we must be firm. If all troops are not completely removed, and substantial evidence given to this effect, within a specified period of time, we should reestablish a firm blockade, and be prepared for stronger action if necessary.

We must not let up at all on our effort until we have accomplished the goal of returning Cuba to a free society. However, a free Cuba will not mean a hemisphere free from the threat of communism. Only by successfully overcoming the basic economic and social problems of the region, can we conquer the threat.

LAW DAY

(Mr. CORMAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sixth observance of Law Day. In 1961, Congress designated May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A. The theme this year is "Law—Rule of Right not Might."

There are three objectives of Law Day: First, to make more meaningful to Americans their heritage of individual freedom under law; second, to foster increased respect for law and the courts which protect the rights of all citizens; and, third, to emphasize the rule of law in our system, as contrasted with the rule of force and fear under communism.

While we are honoring the rule of law, and the role that it plays in our society, the Communists are parading their military might throughout the Soviet Union and their satellite states. This indeed is one of the essential differences between these systems. We rely on reasoned adjudication to settle our disputes. We jealously guard individual liberties. Their government crushes any dissent by force. Minorities have no rights in the Communist state.

The Constitution is the document which established the institutions of our Government and created the Federal

1963

present unemployment situation, rather than in foreign countries.

As I have been a strong advocate of strict economy in all proposed new expenditures in all Government activities here at home, I should likewise object to the expenditure of millions of dollars in foreign countries. Actually, I consider this more or less another facet of our foreign aid program which I do not believe has produced the desired results.

Second, I object to the passage of this Foreign Service buildings bill because it provides for the construction of new buildings in many emerging nations throughout the world where the government is at best most unstable and the net result could very well be that we would be constructing office buildings for some renegade governmental official such as Castro to confiscate. I believe it the better part of wisdom for us to continue to lease our facilities in these foreign countries until such time as these nations indicate a greater degree of responsibility and permanence.

Also, in this connection, I feel it is extremely difficult, if not impossible—because of the instability of these emerging nations—for us to accurately anticipate the size of diplomatic staff necessary in these various countries. Accordingly, how could we possibly know the requirements for housing and business purposes?

My third objection to this particular measure arises from the report of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee in which it appears that primary consideration for the use of these office buildings and living quarters will be given to the State Department, U.S. Information Agency, and Aid for International Development with only secondary consideration given to such important agencies as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, General Accounting Office, the American Battle Monuments Commission, and similar agencies. If such new office buildings and living quarters are to be constructed in the amount of \$26,324,000, I believe all of our foreign activities should be given priority according to need rather than special preference given to some particular agencies whose effectiveness I seriously question.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I must register my strong opposition to the passage of this particular measure and urge my colleagues to consider long and hard our financial condition as well as the necessity for the expenditure of these millions of dollars overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 293), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In addition to amounts authorized before the date of enactment of this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State—

"(1) for acquisition, by purchase or construction (including acquisition of lease-

holds) of sites and buildings in foreign countries under this Act, and for major alterations of buildings acquired under this Act, the following sums—

"(A) for use in Africa, not to exceed \$7,140,000 of which not to exceed \$3,270,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(B) for use in the American Republics, not to exceed \$5,360,000, of which not to exceed \$4,030,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(C) for use in Europe, not to exceed \$6,839,000, of which not to exceed \$1,820,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(D) for use in the Far East, not to exceed \$2,350,000, of which not to exceed \$2,200,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(E) for use in the Near East, not to exceed \$2,710,000, of which not to exceed \$2,100,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(F) for facilities for the United States Information Agency, not to exceed \$1,125,000, of which not to exceed \$720,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964, and

"(G) for facilities for agricultural and defense attaché housing, not to exceed \$800,000, of which not to exceed \$400,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964;

"(2) for use to carry out the other purposes of this Act, not to exceed \$23,500,000, of which not to exceed \$11,600,000 may be appropriated for the fiscal year 1964.

Sums appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall remain available until expended. To the maximum extent feasible, expenditures under this Act shall be made out of foreign currencies owned by or owed to the United States."

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman, under paragraph (G), why is it necessary to single out housing for the agricultural attaché and the defense attachés in the amount of \$800,000. How about the other attachés, such as labor, and so forth? Why do we have to single out the agricultural attaché and the defense attaché in this case?

Mr. HAYS. The best answer I can give the gentleman is that it is up to the State Department to provide housing for these people and these are the ones they asked housing for. We did not allow every request, but they did ask for housing for the agricultural attachés and the defense attachés.

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to hear the gentleman's response to that question for many times in the past the agricultural attaché at these foreign posts has been left out in the cold. I am glad to see that at this particular juncture, they are being recognized for housing at least.

Mr. HAYS. I think I can say to the gentleman that these two categories, these people, come from these particular Government departments whereas your labor attaché, for example, is actually from the State Department and is usually a Foreign Service officer and is taken care of in that category. Whereas, of course, as you know, the defense attaché is from the Department of Defense and the agricultural attaché is from the Department of Agriculture, but it is the responsibility of the State Department to procure housing for them.

Mr. MICHEL. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. (a) Section 2 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926 (22 U.S.C. 293), is repealed.

(b) The first section of such Act (22 U.S.C. 292) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission hereinafter established,";

(2) by striking out "under such terms and conditions as in the judgment of the commission may best protect the interests of the United States,";

(3) by striking out ", to the extent deemed advisable by the commission,"; and

(4) by striking out ", which buildings shall be appropriately designated by the commission, and the space in which shall be allotted by the Secretary of State under the direction of the commission" and inserting a period and the following: "The space in such buildings shall be allotted by the Secretary of State".

(c) Section 3 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 294) is amended—

(1) by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission," and "in the judgment of the commission,"; and

(2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U.S.C. 529)".

(d) Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 295) is amended by striking out ", subject to the direction of the commission,".

(e) Section 9 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 300) is amended—

(1) by striking out "with the concurrence of the Foreign Service Buildings Commission,"; and

(2) by striking out ", as in the judgment of the Commission may best serve the Government's interest".

(f) Section 1(e) of Reorganization Plan Numbered II of May 9, 1939 (53 Stat. 1432), is repealed.

(g) All references to the Foreign Service Buildings Commission, originally established by the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, in all laws of the United States are hereby repealed.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

May I say if anyone is interested, the reason for these last amendments is that all of the functions of this Commission were transferred to the Secretary of State in 1939 and under the reorganization plan. The Commission has never met since then. I, for one, happen to be a great believer that there are too many laws now, and when we have deadwood we should take it out. We have repealed this, believing it to be in conformity with the facts as they exist.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'NEILL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5207) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 312, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

land has been mentioned on this floor today. Certainly nothing that has been said about Neil MacNeil overemphasizes or exaggerates his fine qualities as a writer.

Neil MacNeil has said that his purpose in writing the "Forge of Democracy" was to "define the House of Representatives."

In so doing he has quoted a number of earlier descriptions of this great body which his animated scholarship has brought to light.

One that caught my eye was that of an 18th-century commentator:

The design of the House of Representatives is to represent the people of the United States, and to protect their liberties.

In protecting the liberties of the people, this House collectively and its Members individually are often misunderstood. Catcalls, calumny, and caricature are the result. Members are accused of bolshevism on one hand and negative obstructionism on the other. In most cases they are guilty of neither, but have been representing their people in accordance with their conscience and in the light of their experience in life.

Neil MacNeil tells how the House operates and the way in which the Members of this body dedicate themselves to their high calling. The problems of the House are described and analyzed. The achievements of the House in preserving liberty are recorded.

In my judgment, this history of the House will make it at once more human and more understandable, and at the same time more noble and elevated in the opinions of men and women throughout the world.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in praise of Neil MacNeil for his outstanding work, "Forge of Democracy." This book is written by a true student of the legislative process who has recorded the actions of the House of Representatives in true form.

The importance of the House is often underestimated by those who do not understand its constitutional powers and its actual operations. Neil MacNeil does with accuracy.

"Forge of Democracy" should be read by each Member of Congress and all Americans who want to have a greater understanding of the body that speaks as the voice of the American people.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks on the subject of Neil MacNeil's book, "Forge of Democracy," at this point in the Record; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Neil MacNeil's "Forge of Democracy" is a gripping epic of the House of Representatives. Mr. MacNeil has succeeded in portraying the House as the living, dynamic, political institution that we, as Members, know it to be. It brings to the reader historically accurate information about its membership, past and present, and presents it in a manner that brings each episode to life.

I have known Mr. MacNeil for many years and his book reflects his sincerity and the tremendous effort that he has put into its writing. I congratulate him for making this excellent documentary on the history of the House of Representatives available to the reading public, and to students of government.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have permission to sit until 1 o'clock today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CUBA FILE CASTROPHOBIA—A LATIN AMERICAN EPIDEMIC

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the predictions are that a disease seems to be spreading through our sister continent to the south. Castrophobia, a new form of virus, is emanating from Communist Cuba to infect the nations of Latin America. Fidel Castro's dissolution of former administrative aid recently predicted that Communist takeover of Latin America is imminent. Joaquin Ossorio, just arrived in the United States after being freed through arrangements of lawyer James Donovan last week, said in Miami that "Mexico will go first, Cuba will be the base, and the takeover has been prepared there."

Ossorio continued by saying that he did not believe the United States could stop the Communists even if they tried. Americans know better.

Mr. Speaker, how fortunate we are in the United States to be privileged to live in a stable society, with government chosen and upheld in systematic order. This fact comes to us clearly today, May 1, Law Day. Yet to the south, many nations of Latin America are in comparative chaos. Life and property there are protected by law at one moment, are subject to destruction the next.

Mr. Speaker, Law Day brings to every American the responsibility to honor and strengthen the system under which we live. Law Day should cause our Government to examine the responsibility it has to the governed. And Law Day points up the great need for this Nation to exercise its responsibility for leadership in this hemisphere to stem the tide of communism in Latin America.

BLACKOUT ON CRIME NEWS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. BECKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, for almost a year now I have raised the issue on the floor of this House of the high incidence of crime in the District of Columbia and the impossibility for people in the District or their visiting friends to walk the streets of the District either day or night, for fear of their lives.

I am calling the attention of the Committee on the District of Columbia to this situation. They are now holding hearings on legislation to try to correct it. I am wondering how many of us recognize that within the last 10 days, as they have gone through the Washington newspapers, they have found absolutely no record of the crime in the District of Columbia. It has been blacked out of the newspapers. I find on just a little investigation that the Police Department is being prevented from issuing this information to the press. The Committee on the District of Columbia should be investigating, and if they are not I hope they will, investigate this crackdown on the Police Department to keep this important news out of the newspapers. When you talk about managing the news, they have got it right here in the District of Columbia so far as the Police Department is concerned. I think it is a crime that that news is being blacked out of the newspapers. I am surprised the press has not said something about it.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 34, on yesterday, Tuesday, April 30, I am recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Aspinall	Healey	Roosevelt
Beermann	Hébert	Ryan, Mich.
Buckley	Leggett	St. Onge
Celler	Lennon	Scott
Chenoweth	Lloyd	Shelley
Conte	Miller, Calif.	Sisk
Davis, Tenn.	Nedzi	Staebler
Dawson	Powell	Van Pelt
Edmondson	Reid, Ill.	Walter
Flynt	Rivers, Alaska	White
Forrester	Rivers, S.C.	Willis
Hagan, Ga.	Rogers, Colo.	
Hansen	Rogers, Tex.	

May 1

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 396 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT EXTENSION

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 325 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3872) to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3872, a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

The resolution is an open rule, providing for 2 hours of general debate.

The purpose of the bill is to extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years, to increase the bank's authorization for insurance and guarantee from \$1 to \$2 billion, and to increase the limitation on the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding at any time from \$7 to \$9 billion.

Mr. Speaker, when the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, appeared before the Committee on Rules to request a rule on this bill, he stated that he would offer an amendment to the bill which would remove the Treasury borrowing authority for the Export-Import Bank from the bill, and would substitute therefor the provision that annual appropriations would be requested for the lending authority. I have seen the amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, and it will be offered when the House goes into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 325 is a 2-hour open rule. On its adoption the House will consider H.R. 3872, which is a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, to extend the period within which the Export-Import Bank of Washington may exercise its functions, and for other purposes.

This bill would, first, extend the life of the Export-Import Bank for 5 years to June 30, 1968; second, increase the lending authority of the Bank by \$2 billion; and, third, authorize a \$1 billion increase in the exporter insurance program of the Bank.

So far as I know there has only been one point of controversy on this bill. That turns on the point of whether the \$2 billion of increased lending authority of the Bank would be financed by back-door borrowing from the Treasury or with appropriated funds.

The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee in his appearance before the Rules Committee, informed our committee he would offer an amendment when the bill was brought before the House, to subject the provision of funds for the increased lending authority to the appropriations process. I believe that should eliminate the controversy on the bill.

There is general agreement the Export-Import Bank has operated on a sound business basis and that it is a valuable instrument in assisting private financial institutions in financing our foreign trade.

Now it is known, of course, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] offers an amendment here which he has stated he will do, which eliminates the back-door spending and ties it down to appropriated funds, it can then, of course, go to the other body and the back-door spending language could be inserted back into the bill. Then it will come back over here and there may be a conference and it may be that we would eventually find that language in the bill.

So, in order to make a little history on the rule here today, I would like to ask some questions of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] so that we can determine specifically what his intent is and what his attitude throughout this legislative procedure will be. Would the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] be so kind as to answer a few questions for me?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH of California. My understanding is that you intend to offer an amendment deleting the back-door spending and tie it down to appropriated funds; is that correct?

Mr. PATMAN. It is my plan and purpose and I will offer a substitute to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert language as follows:

In order further to enable the Bank to carry out its objects and purposes under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed upon an appropriation of funds for that purpose to purchase from time to time such additional obligations as the Bank may issue in an amount not to exceed \$2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I ask the gentleman further: We are aware that if it goes to the other body and it is amended there and the language on back-door spending is put back in, then I wonder what your position will be following that?

Mr. PATMAN. As a conferee I will uphold the position of the House, and I feel it will be the duty and obligation of each of the conferees on the part of the House to assume that attitude and be firm in that position.

Mr. SMITH of California. May I ask if the language is the same as you told me before we started on the rule, then you would be adamant in your position with respect to the position of the House?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right. The gentleman uses the correct word to describe it. We would be adamant in our position.

Mr. SMITH of California. I have been informed by one of the Members on this side that if this bill comes back with that back-door language in it, he would object and send it to the Rules Committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, if the other body should be adamant in its position, then we would have no legislation at all. This act expires on June 30. I think this legislation is too important for either side or for any Member not to try to get the act extended, and if we get into an impasse, then we would have to do the best we can after consulting those with whom we should consult and take such action as the leaders and others feel we ought to take.

Mr. SMITH of California. Just one other question, if I may.

One of the Members came to me just a short while ago and stated to me that he had heard information or a rumor to the effect that the Export-Import Bank has just recently concluded a loan to Communist Yugoslavia. Are you aware of anything like that?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I am not aware of it.

Mr. SMITH of California. I wonder if this information is brought to your attention, if you will have your committee check into a situation like that.

Mr. PATMAN. That would be something that is up to the executive branch of the Government, I would assume. What kind of a loan is involved, if any? Is it possibly a loan that the gentleman from California might agree with? I do not know just what it might be.

Mr. SMITH of California. I just do not happen to believe that the Export-Import Bank should be lending money to Communist Yugoslavia which is out to take over our Government. I would like to have somebody check that particular situation to see if it exists.

Mr. PATMAN. Generally, I am opposed to doing any business with any